

15
L'ESTRANGE
NO
P A P I S T.

Odi profanum vulgus & arceo.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *F. Leach*, for *Charles Brome*,
at the Gun at the West-End of

St. Pauls. MDCLXXXV.

TESTRANGE

NO

TEST

Old profumery & essences

LONDON

Printed by F. Leach, for Charles Browne,
at the Gun at the West-End of

St. Pauls. MDCCLXXXV.

L'E S T R A N G E
N O
P A P I S T
N O R
J E S U I T E, &c.

P^{Rag.} Well and what is become of your *L'Estrange* now I trow, your great *Goliath* *L'Estrange*, and your so much Idolized *Diana*?

Philo. Very wel; and is this all you can say? no less than a Gyant and a Goddess both in a breath? could not you have said your *Gogmagog* and your *Penthesilea* Queen of the *Amazons*? it would have done every whit as well, and have made a more noble sound, but that such hard names might have chanced to have stuck in your Throat and choaked you. But pray tell me *Mr. Pragmaticus*, what makes you so inquisitive

after *L'Estrange*? I shall shrewdly suspect you are the man that sent out the Hue and Cry after him, unless you give me very good reasons to believe the contrary.

Prag. No really not I: But I hear there is one gone out after him, but cannot overtake him, and I cannot imagine why it should not, unless you have sent him away Post upon *Pegasus*, or swept him into a corner with your Broom amongst your refuse stuffe. Tis great pity a man of parts as he is should ly sculking about at this rate, and not dare to show his head. I fancy he looks very pleasantly upon it, and dare swear a Cut of him in the present posture he is in would sell rarely well.

Philo. Come leave off your silly scoffs, and witless reproaches, and let us know what is the quarrel you have against *L'Estrange*.

Prag. Quarrel quoth he? Why he is a *Papist*, and is not that Quarrel enough in all Conscience? and you deserve to be called in question, if you take his part, or maintain that he is not.

Philo. So, very good still. Then I perceive it is become now as criminal to speak well of *L'Estrange*, as to drink the Dukes Health, and all because one is supposed to be a *Papist*, and the other is so. But pray tell me one thing, supposing, though not granting *L'Estrange* to be a *Papist*, may not a man for all that speak in his behalf, *quatenus* an honest man?

Prag.

Prag. That is a good one : An honest *Papist* ? who ere heard of that before ? no let me tell you, it is an absurdity, nay an utter impossibility. An honest man perhaps may be a *Papist*, but a *Papist* can never be an honest man : and there is the short and the long of the business pithily delivered in few words.

Philo. All pith I confess, and no sap. But under favour is this learned and nice distinction your own, or did you borrow it ?

Prag. No matter for that. I say still the *Papist* *L'Estrange* is a *Papist* ; and whosoever speaks a good word of him is a Popeling, an Abettor of the Diabolical party, and an ill Commonwealths man. And if you say the Dukes Health may be drank ; I affirm that such an assertion destroys the Liberty of the Subject, as much as denying the Right of Petitioning, and therefore as a filthy, abominable and superstitious thing ought to be laid aside.

Philo. Acutely argued. I perceive by this you are a man of parts and perhaps can give me the reason (which I confess I never heard yet) why you think *L'Estrange* is a *Papist*.

Prag. What need of any Reason, when all the Town and Country say so ? sure their words may be taken without any farther Reason.

Philo. And therefore you believe him to be a *Papist*, because he is generally reported one.

Prag.

Prag. Yes marry do I: and every good Christian ought to do the like.

Philo. I always thought that every mans own persuasion and practice had made him of this or that Religion, and not anothers saying so: But it seems you think otherwise, and *L'Estrange* must needs be a *Papist*, because the people vote him one: then I say, according to your way of arguing, if he be a *Papist*, they ought to be punished for being accessory to his being such, for it is evident he was none before they talked him into it, What have you to say to this?

Prag. Ay but it is sworn against him (they say) that he is one, and sure that will serve your turn.

Philo. Indeed this has prevented me from asking you one question, which was, how the Town and Country, which you say generally believe him to be a *Papist*, should come to know so much, unless he had declared it to them himself, and given a Certificate under his own hand to put the matter out of dispute, for his publick Profession has all along spoken the quite contrary. But now I understand that the ground which you or they have to believe him a *Papist*, is only because such and such have sworn against him that he is one. Doth their swearing then make him a *Papist*, whether in his own Opinion he be so really or no?

Prag. I say if they swear he is a *Papist*, I am bound to believe it : and if they should do as much for you I would endeavor to have you prosecuted.

Philo. I grant you that then in the Eye of the Law he is one, for that proceeds and judges according to the Testimony given upon Oath : but this is not the business in Dispute. I would fain know whether any impartial person (these Oaths that you speak of notwithstanding) may not, all circumstances well considered, still conclude that *L'Estrange* is all this while an honest man, and a true Son of the Church of *England* ?

Prag. Not at all : for I tell you, as I said before, if it be given upon Oath that he is a *Papist*, I dare pawn my life that he is one, and I look upon the testimony to come from such well meaning persons, and true Lovers of the Church, that I dare safely swear the same my self.

Philo. Very pretty : but what if two or three well meaning malicious fellows should swear that you was in the Plot, would you therefore be such a fool to believe it, and swear the same, and so e'ne be fairly trussed up for your pains.

Prag. Why no, the case is altered then : And I would say, that they were a company of *Rascals*, that should swear I was in the Plot, when I know no more of it than the child that is unborn : besides, what need I care ? I am clear enough, so long

long as my Conscience plainly tells me that I have no hand in it :

Philo. So, then the Kings Evidence it seems may be a company of Rascals, if they should chance to depose any thing against you, when in the mean time whatsoever is said or sworn against another man passeth with you for an Oracle. This is very fine is it not ? but may not another mans Conscience give these bold swearers the ly as well as yours can do ? and will you not allow poor *L'Estrange* the liberty to make use of the same Plea which you would your self ? This is very hard measure.

Prag. How can that be, when his own Conscience tells him he is a *Papist* and uses to go to Mass ? if he would but have dealt ingenuously, he might have gone to the Council, and informed against himself, without putting any body else to the trouble of doing it.

Philo. And have told them he had a great mind to be hanged, and therefore came to swear that he was up to the Ears in the Plot, though he never so much as dipped his little Finger in it. Pray friend have a care what you say, for if *Dr. Oates* and the rest should come to know that you should offer to advise any man, *Papist* or not *Papist* to do any such thing ; take my word for it, they would certainly fall foul on you for going about to take away their livelyhood. But you said that his

Con-

Conscience tells him so and so: have his Conscience and you had any late Conference together (I dare not say Consult, because it is grown a dangerous word) about these matters, that you are so peremptory in asserting, that it will flatly declare him a *Papist*?

Prag. Nay, if you go on cavilling at your rate, there is no talking with you: pray tell me one thing, how can his Conscience chuse but tell him that he is a *Papist*, when it is so evident, that all the world knows it?

Philo. So evident, that all honest understanding men believe the quite contrary. For to say nothing of his constant and approved Loyalty all along to the King, when he had opportunity enough to be otherwise, of his good carriage and reputed honesty, and the notorious ill manners of his Accusers, though this might be a large Theme for Discourse: what rational sober man could ever think him so ill advised, or (to use the term which some slanderous tongues would fix upon him) so mad, as by publick Writings, and a Practice corresponding to his private Sentiments, to derive a great and everlasting odium upon himself from two different Parties, seemingly as far distant and opposite as the two Poles, though both concentrating in one fatal mischief,

the ruin of this poor Church and State ; I say who can suppose that this man, out of his affectionate Love to his King and Country, and Filial Duty to his Mother the Church of *England*, should expose himself so undauntedly to all the Malice and Spleen that could be vomited out upon him from the mouths of those foul-mouthed Beasts, and yet be all this while a secret favourer of one of these Parties, whilst he pretends to be an open abhorrer of Both ?

Prag. A very fine speech, neatly harangued, as if you had a pention for doing it : but I understand never a word on't : what Parties, what Beasts are these you talk of, or do you but dream ?

Philo. To be more plain with you, I mean the *Papists* on one hand, and the *Fanatics* on the other.

Prag. Oh, now I understand you : and this is wonderful strange you say, that he should be a profest enemy to the *Papists*, and yet be one himself underhand : I pity your ignorance ; as if the Pope could not grant a Dispensation for all this : why it is ordinarily done in such cases, and I thought you had not been so shallow as not to apprehend it.

Philo. You will make a mear changling of his Holiness by and by, if you could but prove that he would grant a Dispensation to have his own
throat

throat cut. When the Pope sends Emissaries into *England* to promote the *Catholic Cause*, perhaps he may allow them to make use of some Pious Frauds the better to carry on their designs, and when some of them have the honour to die Martyrs at *Tyburn* with a lye in their mouths, then goes the common cry, that they have the Popes Dispensations and Absolutions to lick all whole again: and granting this to be so, nay and more than that, that *L'Estrange* had a Dispensation too, what great harm would it do, so long as it is only to preserve his Allegiance and approve himself true and faithful to his Church, King and Country?

Prag. Ay but these confounded Dispensations are of a strange nature, for I have heard that by the strength of one of them a man may come to our Church, wear a Peruque and a Sword by his side, flatter and fawn upon the King, and cry God bless your Majesty, I wish you a long and prosperous Reign, and then Stab or Poison him at the first opportunity, and yet for all at last go to Heaven in a string. And I think on it a little better, might not *L'Estrange* be a Jesuite and be like enough to do some such like Prank at the long Run?

Philo. What and no *Papist* ? for I hope I have convinced you that he is not.

Prag. Yes for ought I know he may.

Philo. And a married man too ?

Prag. That does not signifie a rush : for I tell you that plaguy Dispensation, (would it was hanged) has done more mischief to this Kingdom than all the *French* Kings Garlick Eaters would do if they should come over : For they say Priests and Jesuites cannot marry, but I'll warrant they may upon a good account, and therefore I say still, for ought I know *L'Estrange* may be a Jesuite, though he is a married man, and no *Papist* neither as you say : And that is nothing but a blind, a mere blind.

Philo. You might as well say a man may be Bred and Born in *London*, and yet be no *English*-man. I tell thee plainly, thou art one of those smatter-braind fellows, that catch at all they can hear, and understand things by halves, and get the names of *Papist* and *Jesuite* into their mouths, and make a great rumbling noise with them enough to sour all the Milk in the Kingdom, and do not know one syllable what their meaning is.

Prag.

Prag. Not know what their meaning is? I thank you heartily for that: you might as well say I did not know my own name. No I'll warrant, when they would have blown up the Parliament-House on the fifth of *November*, when they stirred up Rebels in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, and raised a Civil-War in *England*, and caused the King to be put to death, and when they Fired the City, and now in this present Plot endeavoured to kill our most Gracious Sovereign, we did not know what their meaning was; what other meaning could they have but to kick good old Protestantism out of doors; and introduce Popery, and set up a company of Shavelings in the Church? Uds my life, he that does not at this time of the day see plainly what their meaning is; I affirm him to be a stark blind Ass, and I stand to it.

Philo. These are bloody things you lay to their charge, and perhaps some of them may be true; and for avoiding contention we will grant them all to be so for once, whether they be or no; but don't you think the *Papists* were the Contrivers, the Plotters, or the Authors (call them which you will) of the last great Plague among us too?

Prag.

Prag. Nothing more likely in my judgment; for what with their Mass mumbling, their Exorcisms, Conjurations, Incense and Holy-water (God bless us) they have raised such a pother and sent such a foule stink among us enough to cause an infection to spread not only over the City, but the whole Nation too.

Philo. Ingeniously made out, if you had added their Squibs and Crackers too. But this is nothing to the business I was mentioning; for when I spoke of *Papists* and *Jesuites*, I said you did know what the words meant, and if you do, pray do me the favour to tell me.

Prag. That I will. Why look you now, if you could get a Painter to draw a company of ill-looking fellows with Bags of Gun-power and Pistols in one hand, and Daggers and long Knives in the other, that would be the very Picture of *Papists* and *Jesuites*.

Philo. But then I suppose it must be writ under them, these are *Papists*, and these are *Jesuites*, as they use to write a company of Verses underneath to explain the Frontispiece.

Prag.

Prag. No there would be no need of that; for I tell you their very looks would betray them and speak what they are.

Philo. This is the notion then I perceive you have of them: but you forget to describe their Religion: Do you think they are Christians or no?

Prag. No by my Faith, hang me if I do: for I look upon the Grand *Signior* or the Great *Mogul* to be a thousand degrees better Christians than they.

Philo. But what if I should prove that they are Christians?

Prag. Do that, and I'll say as you say.

Philo. All proof would be needless to a man of understanding: But first, I'll take it for granted that ours is but a Reformed Church; and wherever there is a Reformation, there must be supposed some Errors and Abuses which were to be Reformed. Now these Errors and Abuses were and are still in the Church of *Rome*, which no more hinder it from being a Christian Church (though grossly corrupted) than a company of Boils and Sores should make you cease to be a man (though an infirm one) The case then is thus; should some of these Boils and Botches, which I will suppose

pose to be in your Body, be cured and done away, that part which had them may be said to be whole again : so our Church of *England* being but part of the Catholic Church was once infected with those abominable impurities and foul Diseases the Church of *Rome* now labours under, from which being cleansed, and purged, it became a pure Church, sound and healthful, whilst the Church of *Rome* remains tainted at this day. And so you your self being (as you would make me believe you are) a true Protestant, are neither better nor worse than (be not started at the word) a Reformed *Papist* by derivation from your Ancestours. This I hope will convince you that the *Papists* are neither Dogs nor Cats, Wolves, Dragons, nor fiery Serpents, but men like you and I, and Christians too, but not so good as they ought to be, nor as it is wished they were.

Prag. This something gravels me if it be true : but what is all this to the proving *L'Estrange* no *Papist*? so long as people write and talk against him and call him *Papist*, I cannot find in my heart but believe them.

• *Philo.*

Philo. And so some impudent malicious Rascals call him Hang-Dog, and Towzer, &c. and do you therefore think in your Conscience, that he is either a Bull-Dog, Spaniel, Mongrel or the like ; I have not much time to talk with you about this matter, but will only tell you in few words, that *LEstrange* is yet a true and sincere Protestant notwithstanding all the trifling Reasons that you or any one else could ever yet bring against him. VVe are not to make ill conclusions from the present misfortunes of the manner, frame, unreasonable and uncharitable conjectures and surmises, from his absconding for a time, which may be for Reasons best known to himself, and not so fit to be known to his Enemies : but I hope it will not be long ere he will return with a VVhip and a Bell to lash these barking Curs, that durst hardly snarl or grin whilst ~~he shewed his Face. T's sure there was never~~ a more impudent and brazen-faced Age, than this we live in, when the best men shall be aspersed with foulest Calumnies, and the best Protestants, the Bishops themselves not passing scot-free, be branded with odious names of *Papists* for being zealous for their King and Countries good. It is to be wished that we
could

could once see a Reformation in our manners instead of seeking one continually in our Religion. And then we should let Protestants be Protestants still, and *L'Estrange* might live quietly without having the imputation of Popery belched out upon him through every poisonous and malicious throat. And so farewell till we meet next time.

FINIS.
